

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for his suggestion of how to amend Claim 1 to place the claims in condition for allowance.

I. Drawings

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that in the drawings, Figures 1 and 2 should be designated with a legend such as -Prior Art-. In accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, Applicant has amended the drawings as shown in red on the attached sheet of drawings to include a -Prior Art- legend for Figures 1 and 2.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has requested Applicant to supply a drawing showing the second supplementary core (134b). Applicant has included a new Figure 4C. Figure 4C shows the thin iron sheet of the second supplementary core. No new information has been added which was not already disclosed in the patent application as originally filed.

II. Specification

In the Office Action, the Examiner contends that certain phrases in the Specification are unclear. In paragraph [0030], the Examiner contends that the sentence "The magnet holes 112, formed at the thin iron sheets 110 of the main core 131, are not formed at the thin iron sheets 120 of the first supplementary core 134a, and

the hole 121 is extended." is unclear. The Examiner contends that according to FIG. 3B, both supplementary cores (134a and 134b) do not have magnet holes 112. The Examiner contends this is not clearly stated in the specification. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In the last sentence in Paragraph [0030], Applicant states that "Except for the hole 131, the shape of the second supplementary core 134b is the same as that of the first supplementary core 134a." Thus, the first supplementary core 134a and the second supplementary core 134b are the same except for the hole. Applicant has amended Paragraph [0030] to further clarify this statement.

III. Election/Restriction

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that the Election/Restriction requirement is deemed proper and made final. Applicant has cancelled the non-elected claims.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner contends that "a supplementary cores" is grammatically incorrect. Applicant has amended Claim 1 to overcome the Examiner's rejection. Such action is earnestly solicited.

V. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 1-2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicant's prior art Figures 1 and 2 in view of Neumann, U.S. Patent 4,469,970. The Examiner further states that Claims 2-3 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicant's prior art Figures 1 and 2 in view of Neumann, U.S. Patent 4,469,970 and further in view of Kloster et al., U.S. Patent 5,142,178.

Applicant respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statements. However, in order expedite prosecution of the subject patent application, Applicant has amended Claim 1 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 and all claims based on Claim 1 are now in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

V. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's claimed invention is deserving of patent protection because it describes a useful and functioning apparatus which is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that this Amendment Letter, including the amendments to the Specification and the Claims, and in view of the Remarks offered in conjunction therewith, are fully responsive to all aspects of the objections and rejections tendered by the Examiner in the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that he has persuasively

demonstrated that the above-identified Patent Application, including Claims 1-4 are in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

If the foregoing does not place the case in condition for immediate allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned for purposes of a telephone interview.

If there are any fees incurred by this Amendment Letter, please deduct them from our Deposit Account NO. 23-0830.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey D. Moy
Reg. No. 39,307
Attorney for Applicants

Weiss, Moy & Harris, P.C.
4204 N. Brown Ave.
Scottsdale, AZ 85251
(480) 994-8888 (Phone)
(480) 947-2663 (Fax)

JDM/wp